

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21 stand rejected.

***Telephonic Examiner Interview***

Applicants' representative and examiner conducted a telephonic interview on April 1, 2009 where the independent claims were discussed. No agreement was reached.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101***

Claims 8-12 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC 101 because the examiner states that the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claim 8 to recite “a processor.” Applicants respectfully submit that the present amendment overcomes the rejection to claim 8 as well as dependent claims 9-12 and 14.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103***

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21 stand rejected under 31 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leach et al (6,412,020) in view of Gupta (“Building a Custom Project Wizard in Visual Studio .NET”, May 2003, *Infosys Technologies Limited*) and Dardinski et al. (6,754,885).

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8 and 15 to clarify that it claims the use of “component objects” or “components.” This is supported in the specification in at least paragraphs [0033] and [0034]. A component is known in the art to be different from an object-oriented programming object as used in Leach. A component exists at a higher level of abstraction as an object. For example, a component does not share state, which an object-oriented object does, and a component communicates with another component by exchanging messages carrying data, which an object-oriented object does not.

Leach appears to use the term “object” to refer exclusively to an object in an object-oriented programming language, such as C++. This is apparent throughout the reference, such as at col. 2, lines 22-34 (“Object-oriented programming techniques employ a concept

referred to as inheritance to allow the sharing of code ... In the C++ language, object-oriented techniques are supported through the use of classes.”), and col. 2, lines 55-64 (“An instance of a class is also called an object of the class ... The Following statements assign data to the data members of objects a and b. a.x = 2; ...).

Further, applicants herein state their intention to soon file a declaration of prior invention pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.131 to swear behind the cited Gupta non-patent literature reference with a declared date of invention no later than November 26, 2002. This date is earlier than May, 2003 when the Gupta reference was published. As such, when the declaration has been filed, applicants will respectfully submit that Gupta is not prior art with regard to the present application.

Further, applicants respectfully submit that Leach does not teach those parts of the claims that the examiner states are taught by Gupta, and that Dardinski teaches neither those parts of the claims that the examiner states are taught by Gupta, nor those portions of those claims that are amended.

As such, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 8 and 15 are in condition for allowance, as are respective dependent claims 2-5 and 7, 8-12 and 14, and 16-19 and 21.

Date: April 16, 2009

/ Peter Trahms-Neudorfer /  
Peter Trahms-Neudorfer  
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439